

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 13, 14, 21, 52 and 54-66 will be pending in the above-referenced patent application and are currently under examination. Claims 13, 14, 21, 52, 56, 64 and 65 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced with the foregoing amendment. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

I. FORMALITIES

Claims 13 and 14 have been amended to incorporate the elements of base claim 1 and intervening claims 3 and 11. Claim 21 has been amended to incorporate the elements of base claim 1. Claims 52, 56 and 64 have been amended to incorporate the elements of base claim 49. Claim 65 has been amended to be dependent on claim 64 in order to have proper antecedent basis for the term "counter-cation."

Support for the amendments can be found throughout the application as originally filed. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner enter the amendment.

II. REJECTIONS

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 10, 19, 49-51 and 53 under 35 USC § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Brow *et al.* (US Patent No. 6,001,567). Applicants respectfully note that the rejected claims have been canceled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully note that the rejection is now moot.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 6-12 and 15-19 under 35 USC § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Williams *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,232,075 B1) and under § 102(f) as alleging that the instant Applicants did not invent the claimed subject matter. Applicants respectfully note that the rejected claims have been canceled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully note that the rejections are now moot.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 6-12, 18 and 19 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of claims 12-28 of U.S. Patent No. 6,232,075B1. Applicants respectfully note that the rejected claims have been canceled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully note that the rejection is now moot. In addition, as these claims have been canceled, there is no need for the assignee to show that the conflicting inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in the instant application was made or to name the prior inventor of the conflicting subject matter.


III. OBJECTIONS

The Examiner has objected to claims 13, 14, 21, 52 and 54-66 as allegedly being dependent on a rejected base claim. As the Examiner noted that amending the claims to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims would make the claims allowable, Applicants respectfully note that these claims have been so amended. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection and send this application to issue.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,


Joseph R. Snyder
Reg. No. 39,381

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 925-472-5000
Fax: 415-576-0300
JS:art
60397071 v1